



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,238	12/05/2001	James G. Shanahan	D/A1320	8310

25453 7590 08/08/2005

PATENT DOCUMENTATION CENTER
XEROX CORPORATION
100 CLINTON AVE., SOUTH, XEROX SQUARE, 20TH FLOOR
ROCHESTER, NY 14644

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

87

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/683,238

Applicant(s)

SHANAHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Laurie Ries

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-14,16-18 and 21-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-14,16-18 and 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 April 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: request for continued examination, filed 5 July 2005, to the original application, filed 5 December 2001.
2. Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-18, and 21-24 are pending. Claims 7, 15, and 19-20 have been cancelled. Claims 23-24 are newly added claims. Claims 1, 11, and 21 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 11, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647), hereafter referred to as "Horowitz '647", in view of Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,236,987 B1), hereafter referred to as "Horowitz '987", and Mockus ("A Web-Based Approach to Interactive Visualization in Context"), hereafter referred to as "Mockus".

As per claims 1, 11 and 21, Horowitz '647 discloses a system, article of manufacture and method for enriching (or annotating with a predefined theme) the

content of a document using personalities that identify enrichment themes with at least one tag located close to a physical identifier that is associated with a personality (or theme) in a database of personalities (or themes), and a method including recording context information, identifying document content using the recorded context information, enriching the identified document content with the personality, and making the enriched document content available (See Horowitz '647, Column 5, lines 60-64, Figure 7, Column 8, lines 38-67, Column 9, lines 1-63, Figure 8, Column 10, lines 8-27 and Column 11, lines 39-40). Horowitz '647 does not disclose expressly including a personality ID that is associated with the recorded context information recorded by a reader. Horowitz '647 also does not disclose expressly an associated personality that defines a set of document service requests identifying enrichment themes, and recognizing and annotating entities in the identified document content related to the associated personality, or transmitting from the reader the identified document content and personality ID to a meta-document server. Horowitz '987 discloses using a topic ID, recorded with a dynamic content organization module, which reads the content (See Horowitz '987, Column 10, lines 41-61) into a database on a computer, and therefore digitally readable, which is associated with a topic, or personality, in a database of topics, or personalities (See Horowitz '987, Column 8, lines 36-67, Column 9, lines 1-5, and Column 10, lines 36-41). Horowitz '987 also discloses a supertopic arrangement containing associated subtopics, which can be used to enrich a document based on the specific supertopic (See Horowitz '987, Column 11, lines 52-67, and Column 12, lines 1-26), and annotating entities in the identified document content related to the associated

supertopic (See Horowitz '987, Column 8, lines 52-67 and Column 9, lines 1-29). Horowitz '987 also discloses transmitting from the dynamic content organization module, or reader, the identified document content and personality ID to a meta-document server (See Horowitz '987, Column 10, lines 29-41). Mockus discloses embedding contextual data into an interactive document. Mockus also discloses that the interactive documents may be related to data that pertains to particular sporting events, such as NASCAR races, which are seasonal events. Mockus discloses specifically, by way of example, an interactive document with embedded data related to a study of truck races included in the 1999 racing season (See Mockus, Pages 183-184, Sections 5-5.1). Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of embedding data into documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the topic ID and supertopic arrangement of Horowitz '987 with the method of Horowitz '647. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine topic intersections of interest to the user (See Horowitz '987, Column 11, lines 52-56). At the time of the invention it would also have been obvious to include the seasonal sporting event data of Mockus with the system and method of Horowitz '647. The motivation for doing so would have been to support the highlighting or annotating of a subset of data, such as data specific to a particular racing season, so that the reader may focus attention on these subsets when viewing an enriched or annotated document (See Mockus, Page 184, "Potential User Interactions"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Horowitz '987 and Mockus with Horowitz '647 for the benefit of

determining topic intersections of interest to the user, and for the benefit highlighting or annotating of a subset of data, such as data specific to a particular racing season, so that the reader may focus attention on these subsets when viewing an enriched or annotated document, to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 11 and 21.

As per claim 2, Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz '647 also discloses transmitting the recorded personality ID and the context information to a meta-document server, where the meta-document server identifies the document content, associates the identified document content with the personality ID, and enriches the document content (See Horowitz '647, Figure 8, Figure 9, and Column 11, lines 24-32).

As per claim 3, Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus disclose the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Horowitz '647 also discloses that the meta-document server, upon identification of the document content, associates the personality ID with the identified document content (See Horowitz '647, Figure 8, element 808), that the meta-document server recognizes, with at least a first method, an entity in the document content (See Horowitz '647, Column 8, lines 50-61), that the meta-document server accesses, with at least a second method, a document service using the recognized entity (See Horowitz '647, Column 9, lines 28-63), that the meta-document server annotates the identified document content with output from the document service to define enriched document content (See Horowitz '647, Figure 8, element 810, and Column 10, lines 22-27), and that the meta-document server makes the enriched

document content available to a set of one or more users (See Horowitz '647, Column 11, lines 39-40).

As per claim 22, Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus disclose the limitations of claim 21 as described above. Horowitz '647 also discloses transmitting the recorded topic ID and context information to a meta-document server, where the meta-document server identifies the document content, associates the identified document content with the personality ID, and enriches the document content (See Horowitz '647, Figures 8 and 9), where the meta-document server, upon identification of the document content, associates the topic ID, personality ID, with identified document content (See Horowitz '647, Figure 8, element 808), recognizes, with at least a first method, an entity in the document content (See Horowitz '647, Column 8, lines 50-61), accesses, with at least a second method, a document service using the recognized entity (See Horowitz '647, Column 9, lines 28-63), annotates the identified document content with output from the document service to define enriched document content (See Horowitz, Figure 8, element 810, and Column 10, lines 22-270, and makes the enriched document content available to a set of one or more users (See Horowitz, Column 11, lines 39-40).

4. Claims 4-6 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647), hereafter referred to as "Horowitz '647", in view of Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,236,987 B1), hereafter referred to as "Horowitz '987", and Mockus ("A Web-Based Approach to Interactive Visualization in Context"), hereafter

referred to as "Mockus", as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Wang (U.S. Publication 2002/0023215 A1).

As per claims 4-6 and 12-14, Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz '987 also discloses transmitting document tokens with the personality ID to the meta-document server (See Horowitz '987, Column 9, lines 31-40). Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus do not disclose expressly recording the digitally readable ID from an electronic tag with an electronic tag reader, or from embedded data recorded on a hardcopy document with a scanner. Wang discloses recording an ID from a printed electronic barcode using a barcode scanning device (See Wang, Page 12, paragraph 0115). Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 Mockus and Wang are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of recording electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to include the recording of an ID from a barcode scanning device of Wang with the system and method of Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to conveniently and comfortable perform a transaction from any location (See Wang, Page 2, paragraph 0012). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wang with Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus for the benefit of allowing the user to conveniently and comfortable perform a transaction from any location to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4-6 and 12-14.

5. Claims 8-9, 16-17, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647), hereafter referred to as "Horowitz

'647", in view of Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,236,987 B1), hereafter referred to as "Horowitz '987", and Mockus ("A Web-Based Approach to Interactive Visualization in Context"), hereafter referred to as "Mockus", as applied to claims 1, 14 and 17 above, and further in view of Goodisman (U.S. Publication 2002/0069223 A1).

As per claims 8-9, 16-17, and 23-24, Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus disclose the limitations of claims 1, 11, and 21 as described above. Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus do not disclose expressly that the recorded context is one of position information and time information and where the recorded context information is one of a timestamp that records when the recording took place and a position ID that identifies a position of the physical object. Goodisman discloses including time and location information in context data (See Goodisman, Page 2, paragraph 0025). Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 Mockus and Goodisman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of linking hypertext data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the time and position information of Goodisman with the context data of Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus. The motivation for doing so would have been to present different information to different users through context filtering (See Goodisman, Page 2, paragraph 0025). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Goodisman with Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus for the benefit of presenting different information to different users through context filtering to obtain the invention as specified in claims 8-9, 16-17, and 23-24.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647), hereafter referred to as "Horowitz '647", in view of Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,236,987 B1), hereafter referred to as "Horowitz '987", and Mockus ("A Web-Based Approach to Interactive Visualization in Context"), hereafter referred to as "Mockus", as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Keith (U.S. Publication 2002/0032672 A1).

As per claim 10, Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus do not disclose expressly providing notification that the enriched document is available. Keith Jr discloses notifying a user regarding updated data (See Keith Jr, Pages 10-11, paragraph 0092). Keith Jr, Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of processing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the user notification of updated data of Keith Jr with the enriched document of Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus. The motivation for doing so would have been to push information to users when desired new information is entered into the system (See Keith Jr, Page 11, paragraph 0092). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Keith Jr with Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987 and Mockus for the benefit of pushing information to users when desired new information is entered into the system to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

7. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,122,647), hereafter referred to as "Horowitz '647", in view of Horowitz (U.S. Patent 6,236,987 B1), hereafter referred to as "Horowitz '987", Mockus ("A Web-Based Approach to Interactive Visualization in Context"), hereafter referred to as "Mockus", and Wang (U.S. Publication 2002/0023215 A), as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Goodisman (U.S. Publication 2002/0069223 A1).

As per claim 18, Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987, Mockus and Wang disclose the limitations of claim 14 as described above. Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987, Mockus and Wang do not disclose expressly identifying position coordinates where the personality ID, or topic ID, is recorded. Goodisman discloses including time and location information in context data (See Goodisman, Page 2, paragraph 0025). Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987, Mockus, Wang and Goodisman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of recording electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the time and position information of Goodisman with the context data of Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987, Mockus and Wang. The motivation for doing so would have been to present different information to different users through context filtering (See Goodisman, Page 2, paragraph 0025). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Goodisman with Horowitz '647, Horowitz '987, Mockus and Wang for the benefit of presenting different information to different users through context filtering to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-18, and 21-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Feiner discloses an integrated system for creating and presenting complex computer-based documents.
- Sezan (U.S. Publication 2004/0267805 A1) discloses an audiovisual information management system.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have

Art Unit: 2176

questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
8/4/2005